APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/979,810	11/25/1997	TOSHIYUKI ONO	ASA-689	6236

7590   05/20/2002

FAY SHARPE BEALL FAGAN
MINNICH & MCKEE
104 EAST HUME AVENUE
ALEXANDRAI, VA   22301

EXAMINER
THOMPSON JR, FOREST

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3625	

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 07-01)

	Application		Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	08/979,810		ONO ET AL.
	Examiner		**Art Unit**
	Forest O. Thompson Jr.		3625

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _11 March 2002 and 05 April 2001_ .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-14 and 29-44_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1-14 and 29-44_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1)☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Applicant filed an Appeal Brief (see paper #28) on 03/11/2002 and an

amendment (amendment F, see Paper #23, not entered) on 09/20/2001. An examiner's

answer was not submitted because of additional considerations in the rejection of

applicant's claims.

2.   This Office Action is responding to applicant's amendment E to the claims (see

Paper #20) filed 04/05/2001. Applicant's amendment necessitated new rejections

based on prior art previously identified and used. This Office Action is responding to

applicant's arguments which were presented in the Appeal Brief (see paper #28), since

these arguments encompass those of amendment E and additional points.

3.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can

be found in a prior Office action (see Paper No. 2), or will be included here for clarity, as

necessary. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not otherwise provided in a

prior Office action will be included in this action where appropriate.

4.   Claims 1-14 and 29-44 have been examined.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5.   Claims 30-37 and 43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated

by Talati et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,878). Examiner has modified the rejection of

these claims, previously under *35 USC § 102*, for clarity and completeness under *35*

USC § 103 (see section 5).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6.   Claims 1-14 and 29-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over **Talati et al.** (U.S. Patent No. 5,903,878) hereafter referred to as

Talati, and further in view of **Wiecha** (U.S. Patent No. 5,870,717).

As per claim 1, **Talati** discloses:

-       transmitting an order for a product in response to an input by a user to said

server through a communication network (col. 3 lines 4-21);

-       receiving trading information including:

--   an e-mail address (col. 8 lines 62-67; col. 9 lines 1-11);

--   a trading identifier associated with said order (col. 8 lines 29-33);

--   data on the contents of said order (col. 3 lines 12-19); and

--   storing said trading information when said e-mail address coincides with

an address of said server to which said order was transmitted (fig. 12 [331, 335, 340]);

-       receiving from said communication network trading processing information

including:

--   an e-mail address (col. 9 lines 45-59);

--   a present status of processing for processing initiated for said order (col.

11 lines 38-67; col. 12 lines 1-19), as disclosed by Talati through the functionality of:

---   *there is illustrated an exchange of information between an*

originator 50 and a recipient 55 using an e-mail delivery system 305. Information

is synonymous with document, software, classified data, transaction data or a

database query and responses. The invention provides a method to securely

exchange and process information between originator 50 and recipient 55, where

an originator and recipient can be client or server on the Internet/Intranet or

private network.

---   *While the following is described with respect to an e-mail delivery*

system it should be realized that any type of delivery system would be useful.

The originator 50 sends a document including a UTID and originator identifier

(OID) to recipient 55 within an e-mail message at 430. Upon receipt of the e-mail

message, the recipient 55 forwards another e-mail message to the transaction

administrator (TA) 60 at 435. The e-mail message includes the OID, UTID and

document name. The TA 60 authenticates the OID of originator so a message

can be transmitted to the originator. If OID does not authorize, the TA 60 sends

a negative response to recipient 55 at 450. Otherwise, the TA 60 requests

originator 50 to validate the transaction via another e-mail message at 440. The

e-mail message includes the UTID.

---   *The originator 50 validates transactions by comparing UTID with a*

list 100, including UTIDs generated by the originator along with associated

information. The originator 50 sends a negative acknowledgment due to failure to

match a UTID or associated information if the transaction is invalid or a positive

acknowledgment if the transaction is valid and the UTID and associated

information matches at 445. The TA 60 upon receipt of a positive or negative

validation of the transaction with the associated UTID notifies the recipient of a

positive status at 450.

--   a present status of processing for delivery of said product corresponding

to said order (col. 1 lines 55-67; col. 6 lines 25-43; col. 11 lines 60-67; col. 12 lines 1-

19), as disclosed by the functionality of Talati in:

   ---   *The delivery system between the client 10 and the merchant 20 can*

be a regular mail system, telephone system, computer network or any other

delivery system like UPS or Federal Express. The delivery system between the

client 10 and the merchant 20 must also have some tracking capability. The

delivery system between the merchant 20 and the CCA 30 is typically a private

network providing Point-Of-Sale (POS) processing. All necessary information is

transferred between two or more points in this network with a tracking

mechanism that can follow the transactions. All of the above steps can also be

executed within electronic commerce transactions;

   ---   *The CA 60 responds at step 180, with an authorization for the*

transaction if the client 50 transaction and credit limit have been approved by the

CA processor 61 and if there is a confirmation by client 10 of transaction validity.

If the transaction is not validated by either the CA 60 or client 50, the CA

transmits a rejection of the requested transaction to the merchant at step 185,

and the client is notified by the merchant of the rejection at step 190. Upon

confirmation of the purchase order, the merchandise may be delivered to the

client 50 and a credit card transaction can be completed between client 50 and

merchant 55 at step 195.

-- a present status of processing for payment processing for said trading

(col. 6 lines 1-24; col. 7 lines 25-63), as disclosed by the functionality of Talati in:

--- *Upon receipt of the payment authorization request from the*

merchant 55, a CA processor 61 determines if the purchase order is authorized

at step 100 by attending to the validity of the credit card number, merchant,

amount of purchase, etc., and determine the client identity. The CA 60 transmits

at step 165, the purchase order and the associated UTID 60 and purchase order

data to the client processor 70. The UTID 60 and purchase order data are

processed at the client 50 to determine if they are valid. The transmission from

the CA 60 to the client 50 may be encoded using some type of virtual encryption

key or any suitable encryption technology. The client processor 70 decodes the

transmission (if encrypted) using knowledge of the virtual encryption key method

between the client 50 and the CA 60 and compares the received unique

transaction identifier to a unique transaction identifier list 100 of identifiers

transmitted from the client at step 170 to determine whether to validate the

transaction. The results of the validation is then forwarded to the CA 60. If the

UTID 60 matches an entry within the client list 100 and the purchase order data

checks out with what the client 50 expects, the requested transaction is identified

as valid. If no match for the UTID is found or if the purchase order data is

incorrect the requested transaction is identified as invalid or fraudulent.

---   The CA 60 responds at step 180, with an authorization for the

transaction if the client 50 transaction and credit limit have been approved by the

CA processor 61 and if there is a confirmation by client 10 of transaction validity.

If the transaction is not validated by either the CA 60 or client 50, the CA

transmits a rejection of the requested transaction to the merchant at step 185,

and the client is notified by the merchant of the rejection at step 190. Upon

confirmation of the purchase order, the merchandise may be delivered to the

client 50 and a credit card transaction can be completed between client 50 and

merchant 55 at step 195.

--   the trading identifier (col. 3 lines 4-19; col. 6 lines 1-32; col. 7 lines 25-63);

and

-       comparing said trading identifier and said e-mail address included in said trading

information with said trading identifier included in said trading processing information

(col. 3 lines 20-48), as disclosed by Talati in the disclosure *The identifier is compared to*

a listing of generated transaction identifiers at the client to confirm that the client

authorized the transaction order with which the transaction identifier is associated. .

Talati does not specifically disclose adding said trading processing information to

said trading information stored in said storage device if they are coincident. Official

Notice is taken that it was old and well known that data could be added to a database or

modified in a database as necessary or desired by the user. Also, **Wiecha** discloses

adding, deleting and editing trading processing information to trading information stored in said storage device (col. 9 lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify **Talati** to disclose adding said trading processing information to said trading information stored in said storage device if they are coincident, as disclosed by **Wiecha** and old and well known art, because this provided additional functionality to the database.

As per claim 2, **Talati** discloses comparing said data on the contents of said order included in said trading information with:

- said present status of processing (col. 2 lines 51-55; col. 4 lines 66-67; col. 5 lines 1-67; col. 6 lines 1-43), as disclosed through the functionality of Talati in the disclosures:

-- *The present invention overcomes the foregoing and other problems with a method and apparatus enabling verification and validation of original "electronic commerce transactions" between one or more originators, recipients, and transaction administrators (TA).*

-- *Upon receipt of the validation request, the client decodes, if necessary, the encrypted validation request and extracts the unique transaction identifier therefrom. The identifier is compared to a listing of generated transaction identifiers at the client to confirm that the client authorized the transaction order with which the transaction identifier is associated.*

-- *The originator 50 validates the transaction by comparing at step 95 the UTID with*

a list 100 generated by the processor 70 of the originator listing the UTID associated

with each transaction generated by the originator and notifying the transaction

administrator 60 of the results.

-- *The client processor 70 decodes the transmission (if encrypted) using knowledge*

of the virtual encryption key method between the client 50 and the CA 60 and

compares the received unique transaction identifier to a unique transaction identifier

list 100 of identifiers transmitted from the client at step 170 to determine whether to

validate the transaction.

- said present status of processing for delivery (col. 2 lines 51-55; col. 4 lines 66-

67; col. 5 lines 1-67; col. 6 lines 1-43), as disclosed through the functionality of Talati in

the disclosures:

-- The client processor 70 decodes the transmission (if encrypted) using knowledge

of the virtual encryption key method between the client 50 and the CA 60 and

compares the received unique transaction identifier to a unique transaction identifier

list 100 of identifiers transmitted from the client at step 170 to determine whether to

validate the transaction;

-- The client processor 70 decodes the transmission (if encrypted) using knowledge

of the virtual encryption key method between the client 50 and the CA 60 and

compares the received unique transaction identifier to a unique transaction identifier

list 100 of identifiers transmitted from the client at step 170 to determine whether to

validate the transaction; and

-       said present status of processing for the payment processing (col. 2 lines 51-55;

col. 4 lines 66-67; col. 5 lines 1-67; col. 6 lines 1-43); and

-       outputting a warning message (col. 3 lines 49-54).

As per claim 3, **Talati** discloses:

-       sending to said server a transmission request for trading processing information

including the trading identifier (col. 3 lines 3-19).

As per claim 4, **Talati** discloses transmitting:

-       a time at which said trading processing information is to be received (col. 10 lines

16-29); and

-       a request for said processing information (col. 10 lines 16-29).

As per claim 5, **Talati** does not specifically disclose said present status of

processing includes a delivery completed date for the product; a scheduled delivery

date for said product; nor a payment completed date or scheduled payment date.

Official Notice is taken that a present status of processing for purchase and delivery of

products purchased by buyers is normally provided upon request of the buyer and may

include any or all of: a delivery completed date for the product; a scheduled delivery

date for said product; and a payment completed date or scheduled payment date.

Buyers typically request the present status of their orders and when delivery will be

completed. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify **Talati** to disclose said present status of processing

includes a delivery completed date for the product; a scheduled delivery date for said

product; nor a payment completed date or scheduled payment date, as disclosed by

Wiecha with old and well known art, because this provides information that sellers and

buyers typically want pertaining to purchases.

As per claim 6, neither **Talati** nor **Wiecha** specifically discloses displaying trading

for which delivery has been completed separately from trading for which delivery has

not been completed; nor displaying trading which have been settled separately from

trading which have not been settled. However, Official Notice is taken that it was old

and well known in the art at the time the invention was made that information in a

database may be displayed as required or desired by a buyer or user. Information in a

database may be manipulated as desired by the database user. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify

Talati and **Wiecha** to disclose displaying trading for which delivery has been completed

separately from trading for which delivery has not been completed, and displaying

trading which have been settled separately from trading which have not been settled, as

disclosed by old and well known art, because this provides information that seller and

buyers want pertaining to purchases.

As per claim 7, neither **Talati** nor **Wiecha** specifically discloses calculating a total

amount of money for products which have not been settled; nor displaying the

calculated total amount of money. However, Official Notice is taken that *calculating a total amount of money for products which have not been settled* and *displaying the calculated total amount of money* was old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made. These are typical functions associated with merchant billing practices in merchant locations and at Internet merchant sites, including informing a buyer of the amount for items/products that he currently is ordering. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the disclosures of **Talati** and **Wiecha** to disclose calculating a total amount of money for products which have not been settled, and displaying the calculated total amount of money, as disclosed by old and well known art with, because this supports seller functions for making sales and informs buyers of the amount/value for their proposed purchases.

As per claim 8, **Talati** discloses:
- comparing said total amount of money with a predetermined limit amount (col. 5 lines 12-14); and
- outputting a warning if said total amount of money for the products which have not been settled exceeds aid limit amount (col. 5 lines 15-33).

As per claim 9, neither **Talati** nor **Wiecha** specifically discloses inputting information on a product to be returned nor transmitting said information to said server. Official Notice is taken that inputting information and transmitting information were old

and well known in the art at the time the invention was made. Additionally, Talati

discloses transmitting information by a client in connection with a transaction. Also,

Official Notice is taken that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the

time the transaction was made to provide a capability for the return of defective or

unwanted merchandise as this is a common problem in most merchandising systems

and retail systems. Typically, merchants provide a means to accommodate buyers who

want to return defective or unwanted merchandise in order to maintain customer

satisfaction. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time

the invention was made to modify **Talati** and **Wiecha** to disclose inputting information

on a product to be returned and transmitting said information to said server, as

disclosed by old and well known art, because this provides desired customer service

functions to the system.

As per claim 10, neither **Talati** nor **Wiecha** specifically disclose displaying said

trading information to select a portion of information; creating new order information by

modifying said selected information; nor transmitting said new order information to said

server. However, Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known in the art at the

time the invention was made that computer systems included operating system software

that facilitated cut and paste operations with data to copy or transfer data between

applications and /or files or documents. Additionally, Official Notice is taken that it was

old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made that users could create

new documents by editing old files/documents, making changes, and saving the revised

file/document as a new file, such as a new order. It would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify with **Talati** and **Wiecha** to

disclose displaying said trading information to select a portion of information; creating

new order information by modifying said selected information; and transmitting said new

order information to said server, as disclosed by old and well known art, because this

facilitates users generating new orders from stored files of previous orders.

    As per claim 11, **Talati** discloses:

-    said server includes:

    --   a shopping server (col. 4 lines 63-65);

    --   a payment managing server (col. 4 lines 63-65); and

    --   a delivery managing server (col. 4 lines 63-65);

-    receiving said present status of processing for the processing for said order from

said shopping server (col. 6 lines 1-24);

-    receiving said present status of processing for said payment processing for

trading from said payment managing server (col. 6 lines 1-43);

-    receiving said present status of processing for the processing for said delivery

from said delivery managing server (col. 6 lines 1-60);

    As per claim 12, **Talati** discloses sending to said shopping server a transmission

request for order processing information including a trading identifier (col. 6 lines 1-60).

As per claim 13, **Talati** discloses sending to said payment managing server a

transmission request for payment managing processing information including the

trading identifier (col. 6 lines 1-60).

As per claim 14, **Talati** discloses sending to said delivery managing server a

transmission request for delivery managing processing information including the trading

identifier (col. 6 lines 1-60).

As per claim 29, **Talati** discloses repeating:

-        said step of receiving trading processing information (col. 3 lines 20-48); and

-        said step of comparing (col. 3 lines 20-48).

As per claim 30, **Talati** discloses:

-        receiving an order for a product in response to an input by a user through a

communication network (col. 3 lines 4-33);

-        performing order acceptance processing for said product (col. 3 lines 20-33);

-        transmitting to said client trading information including a trading identifier and

data on the contents of said order (col. 3 lines 20-33);

-        storing said trading information and an e-mail address (col. 8 lines 62-67; col. 9

lines 1-11; fig. 12 [331, 335, 340);

-        creating trading processing information including:

--   a present status of processing for processing initiated for said order (col.

11 lines 38-67; col. 12 lines 1-19), as disclosed by Talati through the functionality of:

---   *there is illustrated an exchange of information between an*

originator 50 and a recipient 55 using an e-mail delivery system 305. Information

is synonymous with document, software, classified data, transaction data or a

database query and responses. The invention provides a method to securely

exchange and process information between originator 50 and recipient 55, where

an originator and recipient can be client or server on the Internet/Intranet or

private network.

---   *While the following is described with respect to an e-mail delivery*

system it should be realized that any type of delivery system would be useful.

The originator 50 sends a document including a UTID and originator identifier

(OID) to recipient 55 within an e-mail message at 430. Upon receipt of the e-mail

message, the recipient 55 forwards another e-mail message to the transaction

administrator (TA) 60 at 435. The e-mail message includes the OID, UTID and

document name. The TA 60 authenticates the OID of originator so a message

can be transmitted to the originator. If OID does not authorize, the TA 60 sends

a negative response to recipient 55 at 450. Otherwise, the TA 60 requests

originator 50 to validate the transaction via another e-mail message at 440. The

e-mail message includes the UTID.

---   *The originator 50 validates transactions by comparing UTID with a*

list 100, including UTIDs generated by the originator along with associated

information. The originator 50 sends a negative acknowledgment due to failure to

match a UTID or associated information if the transaction is invalid or a positive

acknowledgment if the transaction is valid and the UTID and associated

information matches at 445. The TA 60 upon receipt of a positive or negative

validation of the transaction with the associated UTID notifies the recipient of a

positive status at 450.

--   a present status of processing for delivery of said product corresponding

to said order (col. 1 lines 55-67; col. 6 lines 25-43; col. 11 lines 60-67; col. 12 lines 1-

19), as disclosed by the functionality of Talati in:

---   *The delivery system between the client 10 and the merchant 20 can*

be a regular mail system, telephone system, computer network or any other

delivery system like UPS or Federal Express. The delivery system between the

client 10 and the merchant 20 must also have some tracking capability. The

delivery system between the merchant 20 and the CCA 30 is typically a private

network providing Point-Of-Sale (POS) processing. All necessary information is

transferred between two or more points in this network with a tracking

mechanism that can follow the transactions. All of the above steps can also be

executed within electronic commerce transactions;

---   *The CA 60 responds at step 180, with an authorization for the*

transaction if the client 50 transaction and credit limit have been approved by the

CA processor 61 and if there is a confirmation by client 10 of transaction validity.

If the transaction is not validated by either the CA 60 or client 50, the CA

transmits a rejection of the requested transaction to the merchant at step 185,

and the client is notified by the merchant of the rejection at step 190. Upon

confirmation of the purchase order, the merchandise may be delivered to the

client 50 and a credit card transaction can be completed between client 50 and

merchant 55 at step 195.

--   a present status of processing for payment processing for said trading

(col. 6 lines 1-24; col. 7 lines 25-63), as disclosed by the functionality of Talati in:

---   *Upon receipt of the payment authorization request from the*

merchant 55, a CA processor 61 determines if the purchase order is authorized

at step 100 by attending to the validity of the credit card number, merchant,

amount of purchase, etc., and determine the client identity. The CA 60 transmits

at step 165, the purchase order and the associated UTID 60 and purchase order

data to the client processor 70. The UTID 60 and purchase order data are

processed at the client 50 to determine if they are valid. The transmission from

the CA 60 to the client 50 may be encoded using some type of virtual encryption

key or any suitable encryption technology. The client processor 70 decodes the

transmission (if encrypted) using knowledge of the virtual encryption key method

between the client 50 and the CA 60 and compares the received unique

transaction identifier to a unique transaction identifier list 100 of identifiers

transmitted from the client at step 170 to determine whether to validate the

transaction. The results of the validation is then forwarded to the CA 60. If the

UTID 60 matches an entry within the client list 100 and the purchase order data

checks out with what the client 50 expects, the requested transaction is identified

as valid. If no match for the UTID is found or if the purchase order data is

incorrect the requested transaction is identified as invalid or fraudulent.

   ---   *The CA 60 responds at step 180, with an authorization for the*

transaction if the client 50 transaction and credit limit have been approved by the

CA processor 61 and if there is a confirmation by client 10 of transaction validity.

If the transaction is not validated by either the CA 60 or client 50, the CA

transmits a rejection of the requested transaction to the merchant at step 185,

and the client is notified by the merchant of the rejection at step 190. Upon

confirmation of the purchase order, the merchandise may be delivered to the

client 50 and a credit card transaction can be completed between client 50 and

merchant 55 at step 195.

   --   the trading identifier (col. 3 lines 4-19; col. 6 lines 1-32; col. 7 lines 25-63);

and

-     obtaining an e-mail address of a client (col. 8 lines 62-67; col. 9 lines 1-11); and

-     transmitting said trading processing information to said client (col. 3 lines 20-33).

    Talati does not explicitly disclose managing the present status of processing until

the order processing, the delivery and the payment processing are completed. Talati

does disclose verifying and validating various steps of transactions (col. 5 lines 50-67;

col. 6 lines 1-60). Additionally, Wiecha discloses *Purchaser can update status of PO*

manually after receiving acknowledgements, status updates, etc. from vendors via fax,

phone, or mail. Changes to the PO can then be saved to the DB2/2 database on the

Purchasing Server (col. 9 lines 59-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Talati to disclose managing the present status of processing until the order processing, the delivery and the payment processing are completed, as disclosed by Wiecha, because this provides functionality that users desire in reviewing and managing their requested processing (i.e., purchases).

As per claim 31, **Talati** discloses repeating until an end of said trading:

-        creating said trading processing information (col. 11 lines 38-67; col. 12 lines 1-19; col. 6 lines 25-43; col. 6 lines 1-32);

-        obtaining said e-mail address (col. 8 lines 62-67; col. 9 lines 1-11); and

-        transmitting said trading processing information until an end of said trading (col. 3 lines 20-33).

As per claim 32, **Talati** discloses:

-        based on a trading identifier, searching for the present status of processing to create trading processing information (col. 10 lines 41-67; col. 11 lines 37); and

-        transmitting said trading processing information to said client (col. 3 lines 20-33).

Claim 33 is written as a server and contains the same limitations as claim 30; therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claim 34 is written as a storage medium and contains the same limitations as
claim 32; therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claim 35 is written as a server and contains the same limitations as claim 30;
therefore, the same rejection is applied.

As per claim 36, **Talati** discloses a storage medium comprising storage
components having a code sequence for:

-      receiving an order (col. 11 lines 60-67; col. 12 lines 1-19);

-      performing order acceptance processing (col. 11 lines 60-67; col. 12 lines 1-19);

-      transmitting to said client trading information (col. 3 lines 20-33);

-      transmitting to said client a present status of processing (col. 11 lines 60-67; col.

12 lines 1-19), as disclosed by Talati through the functionality of:

     ---   *there is illustrated an exchange of information between an*
originator 50 and a recipient 55 using an e-mail delivery system 305. Information
is synonymous with document, software, classified data, transaction data or a
database query and responses. The invention provides a method to securely
exchange and process information between originator 50 and recipient 55, where
an originator and recipient can be client or server on the Internet/Intranet or
private network.

     ---   *While the following is described with respect to an e-mail delivery*
system it should be realized that any type of delivery system would be useful.
The originator 50 sends a document including a UTID and originator identifier

(OID) to recipient 55 within an e-mail message at 430. Upon receipt of the e-mail

message, the recipient 55 forwards another e-mail message to the transaction

administrator (TA) 60 at 435. The e-mail message includes the OID, UTID and

document name. The TA 60 authenticates the OID of originator so a message

can be transmitted to the originator. If OID does not authorize, the TA 60 sends

a negative response to recipient 55 at 450. Otherwise, the TA 60 requests

originator 50 to validate the transaction via another e-mail message at 440. The

e-mail message includes the UTID.

    --- *The originator 50 validates transactions by comparing UTID with a*

list 100, including UTIDs generated by the originator along with associated

information. The originator 50 sends a negative acknowledgment due to failure to

match a UTID or associated information if the transaction is invalid or a positive

acknowledgment if the transaction is valid and the UTID and associated

information matches at 445. The TA 60 upon receipt of a positive or negative

validation of the transaction with the associated UTID notifies the recipient of a

positive status at 450.

- transmitting a request for delivery of said product to a delivery managing server

(col. 6 lines 40-56), as disclosed by Talati through the functionality of:

    --- *The delivery system between the client 10 and the merchant 20 can*

be a regular mail system, telephone system, computer network or any other

delivery system like UPS or Federal Express. The delivery system between the

client 10 and the merchant 20 must also have some tracking capability. The

delivery system between the merchant 20 and the CCA 30 is typically a private

network providing Point-Of-Sale (POS) processing. All necessary information is

transferred between two or more points in this network with a tracking

mechanism that can follow the transactions. All of the above steps can also be

executed within electronic commerce transactions;

--- *The CA 60 responds at step 180, with an authorization for the*

transaction if the client 50 transaction and credit limit have been approved by the

CA processor 61 and if there is a confirmation by client 10 of transaction validity.

If the transaction is not validated by either the CA 60 or client 50, the CA

transmits a rejection of the requested transaction to the merchant at step 185,

and the client is notified by the merchant of the rejection at step 190. Upon

confirmation of the purchase order, the merchandise may be delivered to the

client 50 and a credit card transaction can be completed between client 50 and

merchant 55 at step 195.

- transmitting a request for payment processing for said trading to a payment

managing server (col. 6 lines 1-24), as disclosed by Talati through the functionality of:

--- *Upon receipt of the payment authorization request from the*

merchant 55, a CA processor 61 determines if the purchase order is authorized

at step 100 by attending to the validity of the credit card number, merchant,

amount of purchase, etc., and determine the client identity. The CA 60 transmits

at step 165, the purchase order and the associated UTID 60 and purchase order

data to the client processor 70. The UTID 60 and purchase order data are

processed at the client 50 to determine if they are valid. The transmission from

the CA 60 to the client 50 may be encoded using some type of virtual encryption

key or any suitable encryption technology. The client processor 70 decodes the

transmission (if encrypted) using knowledge of the virtual encryption key method

between the client 50 and the CA 60 and compares the received unique

transaction identifier to a unique transaction identifier list 100 of identifiers

transmitted from the client at step 170 to determine whether to validate the

transaction. The results of the validation is then forwarded to the CA 60. If the

UTID 60 matches an entry within the client list 100 and the purchase order data

checks out with what the client 50 expects, the requested transaction is identified

as valid. If no match for the UTID is found or if the purchase order data is

incorrect the requested transaction is identified as invalid or fraudulent.

---   The CA 60 responds at step 180, with an authorization for the

transaction if the client 50 transaction and credit limit have been approved by the

CA processor 61 and if there is a confirmation by client 10 of transaction validity.

If the transaction is not validated by either the CA 60 or client 50, the CA

transmits a rejection of the requested transaction to the merchant at step 185,

and the client is notified by the merchant of the rejection at step 190. Upon

confirmation of the purchase order, the merchandise may be delivered to the

client 50 and a credit card transaction can be completed between client 50 and

merchant 55 at step 195.

Claim 37 is written as a server and contains the same limitations as claim 30; therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claim 38 is written as a client and contains the same limitations as claim 2; therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claim 39 is written as a client and contains the same limitations as claim 3; therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claim 40 is written as a client and contains the same limitations as claim 4; therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claim 41 is written as a client and contains the same limitations as claim 11; therefore, the same rejection is applied.

As per claim 42, neither **Talati** nor **Wiecha** disclose a reordering device. **Talati** does disclose storing said trading information and an e-mail address (col. 8 lines 62-67; col. 9 lines 1-11; fig. 12 [331, 335, 340). Official notice is taken that it was old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made that data in a database could be used more than once (i.e., reused) in output reports (e.g., purchase orders) generated from the database, and that reports could be generated using the same data (duplicated) or a combination of the same data and additional data from the database. This is one reason that databases are used. Also, Official Notice is taken that it was old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made that many businesses generate and process orders for goods and services that are repeated over time. Businesses maintain stock levels in their inventory, and re-order periodically to

replenish depleted stock levels or replace exhausted stock or renew performance

agreements. It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time the

invention was made to modify the disclosures of **Talati** and **Wiecha** to disclose a

reordering device, as disclosed in old and well known art, because businesses must

maintain stock levels or renew performance agreements in order to stay in business,

and reordering goods based on prior orders in combination with goods usage (or sales)

simplifies the reorder process.

Claim 43 is written as a server and contains the same limitations as claim 30;

therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Claim 44 is written as a client and contains the same limitations as claim 2;

therefore, the same rejection is applied.

Response to Arguments

7.   Applicant's arguments filed 03/11/2002 and 04/11/2001 have been fully

considered but they are not persuasive. This Office Action is responding to applicant's

arguments which were presented in the Appeal Brief (see paper #28), since these

arguments encompass those of amendment E and additional points.

(a)   <u>35 U.S.C. 9 102 (e) Rejection of Claims 30-37 and 43 based on Talati et al.</u>

Appellants argue at pg. 6 of Appeal Brief (see Paper #28):

In Talati, the Examiner relies upon col. 8, lines 62-67, for example with respect to

the disclosure in the reference of an e-mail record 330 and unique transaction identifier

(UTID) 331. However, this disclosure does not suggest to one having ordinary skill in

the art of providing a client with present status of processing of trading as in the present

invention. In particular, Talati discloses an e-mail system that provides a traceable

delivery system enabling electronic commerce between an originator 50, recipient 55

and transaction administrator (TA) 60. The system of Talati is designed to guaranty the

validity of the electronic commerce transaction by validating that the client owns a

presented credit card number and has initiated the transaction (col. 8, lines 2935). Thus,

according to Talati, electronic commerce transactions are validated with respect to

whether the client who initiates the electronic commerce is the authorized user of an

account number or electronic check.

For example, in Talati, a transaction administrator 60 may query the client via an

e-mail message to confirm whether the client has initiated the transaction. If a UTID

matches an entry within the client list 100 maintains by the client 50, the client can

generate an e-mail message indicating that the requested transaction originated with

the client thereby validating the transaction request. See col. 11, lines 2-16 of Talati.

Accordingly, the reference does not disclose the communication of trading processing

information such as the present status of processing for delivery of a product

corresponding to an order, as set forth in claims 30-37 and 43.

Examiner disagrees. Examiner has modified the rejection to be rejected under

35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Talati in view of Wiecha. Talati does

not explicitly disclose managing the present status of processing until the order

processing, the delivery and the payment processing are completed. Talati does

disclose verifying and validating various steps of transactions (col. 5 lines 50-67; col. 6

lines 1-60). Talati also discloses *A format of an e-mail record 330 is more fully*

described in FIG. 12 wherein there is shown an e-mail record 330 including the unique

transaction identifier or message id 331; a mail type identification 335 indicating whether

the record is to be transmitted, was just received, has already been transmitted, or

comprise a transaction e-mail; the recipient's address 340; the subject matter of the

e-mail 345; and the contents of the e-mail 348. For simplicity, the mail type

identification 335 identifies the state of the e-mail record as it relates to the state of the

e-mail delivery system 305. For example, when a user creates an e-mail record, the

ECS 300 deposits this e-mail record into the mailbox database 315 with mail "type"

equal to 1 indicating that the e-mail record is ready to be delivered to the recipients.

The recipient address 340, subject matter 345 and contents 348 provide routing and

content information to the e-mail delivery system 305 (col. 8 line 62 - col. 9 line 11).

Examiner states that the disclosure includes a current status of the transaction in terms

of *a mail type identification 335 indicating whether the record is to be transmitted, was*

just received, has already been transmitted, or comprise a transaction e-mail.

Additionally, Wiecha discloses *Purchaser can update status of PO manually after*

receiving acknowledgements, status updates, etc. from vendors via fax, phone, or mail.

Changes to the PO can then be saved to the DB2/2 database on the Purchasing Server

(col. 9 lines 59-63). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at

the time the invention was made to modify Talati to disclose managing the present

status of processing until the order processing, the delivery and the payment processing

are completed, as disclosed by Wiecha, because this provides functionality that users

desire in reviewing and managing their requested processing (i.e.,

purchases).Therefore, Talati discloses *to one having ordinary skill in the art a method of*

providing a client with present status of processing of trading as in the present

invention. Therefore, examiner maintains the rejection.

(b)   35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) Rejection of Claims 1-14, 29, 38-42 and 44 Based on Talati

et al. and Wiecha

(1)   Appellants argue at pg. 7 of Appeal Brief:

The Examiner relies upon Talati with respect to the disclosure in the reference of

an e-mail record 330 and unique transaction identifier (UTID) 331. However, the

Examiner recognizes that Talati does not specifically disclose adding trading processing

information to the trading information stored in the storage device if they are not

coincident, as set forth in independent claim 1, claim 38 and claim 44. Accordingly, the

Examiner relies upon Wiecha for disclosing the adding of trading processing information

to trading information stored in the storage device if they are coincident, citing col. 9,

lines 1-11 of the reference. The reason the Examiner states that these references are

combinable is that one having ordinary skill in the art would know to add trading

processing information to trading information stored in the storage device if they are

coincident in order to provide additional functionality to the database.

However, Wiecha does not overcome the deficiencies of the Talati reference. In

particular, Wiecha is directed to an electronic commerce ordering system wherein

trading process information is added to trading information to make a contract for the

trade, as described at col. 4, lines 1-30 of the reference, for example.

Appellants particularly note that claim 1 recites, in combination, a step of

transmitting an order for a product to a server and a step of receiving trading information

including an e-mail address from the network. The claim includes a step of receiving

trading processing information from the network including an e-mail address. Also, the

trading processing information includes the present status of processing for delivery of

the product or order. As an additional step, the trading identifier is compared with the e-

mail address included in the trading information and a warning is output if they are not

coincident. If they are coincident, then the trading processing information is added to the

trading information stored in a storage device. This aspect of the claimed combination of

claim 1 is not suggested by the Talati reference in view of Wiecha.

Each of the pending claims is directed to transmitting trading processing

information to the client which includes the present status of processing for processing

initiated for an order. This aspect of the claimed combination is also not set forth in the

references relied upon by the Examiner in the 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 (e) and 103 (a)

rejections, nor in any of the remainder of the art of record.

Examiner disagrees. Talati discloses:

-a step of transmitting an order for a product to a server (col. 3 lines 4-21);

-a step of receiving trading information including an e-mail address from the network

(col. 8 lines 62-67; col. 9 lines 1-11);

-a step of receiving trading processing information from the network including an e-mail

address (col. 9 lines 45-59);

-the trading processing information includes the present status of processing for delivery

of the product or order (col. 1 lines 55-67; col. 6 lines 25-43; col. 11 lines 60-67; col. 12

lines 1-19);

-the trading identifier is compared with the e-mail address included in the trading

information (col. 3 lines 20-48);

- *a warning is output if they are not coincident (col. 3 lines 49-54), in the disclosure*

Upon receipt of the validation request, the client decodes, if necessary, the encrypted

validation request and extracts the unique transaction identifier therefrom. The identifier

is compared to a listing of generated transaction identifiers at the client to confirm that

the client authorized the transaction order with which the transaction identifier is

associated. Confirmation or denial of the validation is transmitted back to the TA by the

originator.

Talati does not specifically disclose adding said trading processing information to

said trading information stored in said storage device if they are coincident. Official

Notice is taken that it was old and well known that data could be added to a database or

modified in a database as necessary by the user. Also, **Wiecha** discloses adding said

trading processing information to said trading information stored in said storage device if

they are coincident (col. 9 lines 1-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one

skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to combine **Talati** and **Wiecha** with

old and well known art to disclose adding said trading processing information to said

trading information stored in said storage device if they are coincident, because this

provided additional functionality to the database.

(2)   Appellants argue at pg. 9 of Appeal Brief:

The Examiner has set forth a Response to Argument section on pages 15 and 16

of the final Office Action, which Appellants respond to as follows.

The Examiner relies upon Talati et al for disclosing the receiving of processing

information including the present status of processing for processing initiated for an

order, a present status of processing for delivery of a product corresponding to the order

and a present status of processing for payment processing for the trading. However,

Talati et al merely disclose transaction processing and authentication that is decided at

the time of ordering of a product. The present invention is directed to receiving

processing information relating to, for example, the delivery of the product made after

the ordering.

In particular, Talati et al disclose that the originator 50 sends an

acknowledgement that is positive if the transaction is valid. Then the TA 60, upon

receipt of a positive validation of the transaction with the associated UTID, notifies the

recipient of a positive status at 450 (referring to Fig. 16 and col. 11, line 66 - col. 12, line

19 of the specification). If the recipient receives the positive acknowledgement for the

transaction, it accepts the information and the transaction is validated. Thus, the

information regarding authentication relates to the processing of the order and not to the

communication of trading processing information such as the present status of

processing for delivery of a product, for example. Therefore, the reference merely

discloses communication for the purpose of completion of the transaction at the time of

requesting transaction processing.

As noted by the Examiner, Appellants take the position that claim 1, for example,

is not suggested by the Talati et al reference in view of Wiecha. In response, the

Examiner notes that Wiecha discloses that a purchaser can update the status of a PO

manually after receiving acknowledgements, status updates, etc. from vendors via fax,

phone or mail. However, according to the invention as claimed, the status of the delivery

of the product in the present invention is received from the communication network

through which the order for the product is transmitted, which is different from Wiecha.

Examiner disagrees. Talati discloses that *an e-mail system also provides a*

traceable delivery system in an alternative embodiment an e-mail delivery system may

be used not only to exchange information, but to process complex transactions and

safely share information between multiple entities (col. 8 lines 21-25), thus disclosing

that the status of the delivery of the product in the present invention is received from the

communication network through which the order for the product is transmitted, i.e., the

e-mail system. Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the

art at the time the invention was made that the combination of Talati and Weicha

provide the functionality for receiving *the status of the delivery of the product in the*

present invention ... from the communication network through which the order for the

product is transmitted, e.g., via e-mail. Therefore, examiner maintains the rejection.

(3)   Appellants argue at pg. 11 of Appeal Brief:

In particular, as set forth in claim 30, for example, the electronic commerce

support method includes creating trading processing information including a present

status of processing for processing initiated for an order, a present status of processing

for delivery of the product corresponding to the order and a present status of processing

for payment processing for the trading, and the trading identifier. Further, claim 30 sets

forth managing the present status of processing for the processing initiated for an order

and the present status of the processing for delivery of the product corresponding to the

order, as well as the present status of processing for a payment until the order

processing, the delivery and the payment processing are completed. Therefore, the

emphasis of the invention as claimed in directed toward managing the present status of

processing after purchasing of the product.

Although the Examiner notes that Talati discloses a present status of processing

for processing initiated for an order, referring to col. 11, lines 38-67 and col. 12, lines 1-

19 of the reference, the processing referred to is not initiated for information items such

as DELIVERED/NOT DELIVERED 1201 or DELIVERY SCHEDULE/DELIVERED DATE

1202 shown in Fig. 12 of the present application. Comparably, Talati merely discloses

an e-mail system for exchange of information between an originator 50 and a recipient

55. In the exchange, the transaction administrator, upon receipt of a positive or negative

validation of the transaction with an associated UTID, notifies the recipient of a positive

status at 450 (col. 12, lines 5-8 of the reference). The positive status means that the

originator is positively authenticated, namely an indication of the result of authentication

processing. In addition, Talati teaches that if a recipient receives a positive

acknowledgement for a transaction in step 455, it accepts the information (see col. 12,

lines 10-12 of the reference). In this way, the recipient 55 is guaranteed that the

information is received from the desired originator and since the originator 50 has

validated the transaction, the originator is guaranteed that the recipient 55 has received

the information. Thus, the present status of processing claimed by Appellants is

different from that disclosed by Talati et al.

Further, with respect to the present status of processing for delivery of a product

corresponding to an order, Talati fails to disclose this part of the claimed combination.

The present status of processing for delivery according to the invention is directed to

information indicating whether and also when the ordered product was delivered, as

shown in Fig. 14, for example (see delivered status information 1401, 1402 in Fig. 14).

On the other hand, Talati merely describes the transmitting of a positive or negative

response in the authentication processing of the originator identifier (IOD). Specifically,

an e-mail message is forwarded from recipient 55 to the transaction administrator 60

that includes the OID, UTID and document name. The TA 60 authenticates the OID of

the originator so a message can be transmitted to the originator. If the OID does not

authorize, the TA 60 sends a negative response to the recipient 55. Otherwise, the TA

60 requests the originator 50 to validate a transaction via another e-mail message that

includes the UTID. See col. 11, lines 56-65 of the reference. Accordingly, Talati teaches

that if the recipient receives a positive acknowledgement for the transaction, it accepts

the information and the information that is transmitted is consistent with that of a

document, software, classified data, etc. See col. 11, lines 40-42 of the reference.

Examiner disagrees. Talati discloses *The delivery system between the client 10*

and the merchant 20 can be a regular mail system, telephone system, computer

network or any other delivery system like UPS or Federal Express. The delivery system

between the client 10 and the merchant 20 must also have some tracking capability.

The delivery system between the merchant 20 and the CCA 30 is typically a private

network providing Point-Of-Sale (POS) processing. All necessary information is

transferred between two or more points in this network with a tracking mechanism that

can follow the transactions. All of the above steps can also be executed within

electronic commerce transactions (col. 1 lines 56-67). Additionally, examiner takes note

that the claim language does not include *information items such as DELIVERED/NOT*

DELIVERED 1201 or DELIVERY SCHEDULE/DELIVERED DATE 1202 shown in Fig.

12 of the present application. Talati does disclose attributes that encompass the claim

language of Appellants. Therefore, examiner asserts that this disclosure of Talati

encompasses the claimed feature of the present status for a transaction in Appellants'

invention. Therefore, examiner maintains the rejection.

(4)   Appellants argue at pg. 13 of Appeal Brief:

Although the Examiner states that Talati discloses the present status of

processing for payment processing, the reference merely discloses authentication of the

purchase order by the Credit Authority processor (see col. 6, lines 2-3 of the reference).

However, the reference does not disclose processing of the payment. Accordingly, the

reference also fails to teach creating or managing present status of processing for

payment processing for the trading, according to the present invention. This aspect of

the claimed combination is set forth in Fig. 15, for example, with respect to the status of

whether the payment has been settled, see items 1501, 1502. By comparison, although

Talati discloses a banking system 60 that notifies the client 50 and the payor 55 if an

electronic payment transaction is rejected, see col. 7, lines 60-63 of the reference, the

rejection of the electronic payment is not equivalent to the present status of processing

for payment processing for the trading as claimed by Appellants. That is, the rejection of

the electronic payment transaction according to Talati is not disclosed as being subject

to change like the status of payment processing in the present invention. For example,

the status will change between "settled" and "not settled", as shown in Fig. 15.

Examiner disagrees. Examiner maintains that the disclosure that Talati's

disclosure of *authentication of the purchase order by the Credit Authority processor (see*

col. 6, lines 2-3 of the reference), and *a banking system 60 that notifies the client 50*

and the payor 55 if an electronic payment transaction is rejected, see col. 7, lines 60-63

of the reference, as noted by Appellants above, **is** (emphasis added) a present status of

processing of payment processing. Therefore, examiner maintains the rejection.

(5)   Appellants argue at pg. 14 of Appeal Brief:

Although the Examiner states that Talati discloses trading processing information

that includes the present status of processing for processing initiated for an order,

present status for processing for delivery, and for payment processing, the reference

does disclose all of these elements in combination as set forth by Appellants.

Accordingly, Talati et al do not anticipate the invention as claimed in claims 30-37 and

43.

Examiner agrees with Appellants that Talati et al. *does disclose all of these*

elements in combination as set forth by Appellants, and, therefore, examiner maintains

that Talati anticipates the invention as claimed in claims 30-37 and 43. Therefore,

examiner maintains the rejection.

(6)   Appellants argue at pg. 15 of Appeal Brief:

Further, although Wiecha discloses that a purchaser can update the status of a

PO manually after receiving acknowledgements, status updates, etc. from vendors via

fax, phone or mail, the references when taken together do not suggest the status of the

delivery of the product and payment of the product through a communication network as

claimed by Appellants in claims 1-14, 29, 38, 42 and 44. Further, neither of the

references discloses or suggests that part of the combination which sets forth the

comparing of a trading identifier and e-mail address included in the trading information

with the trading identifier included in the trading processing information to output a

warning if they are not coincident, and further to add the trading processing information

to the trading information stored in the clients storage device if they are coincident.

Since each of claims 1-14, 29, 38-42 and 44 includes this aspect of the claimed

combination, these claims stand or fall separately from the claims rejected under 35

U.S.C. § 102 (e) over Talati et al, mainly claims 30-37 and 43.

Examiner disagrees. Examiner asserts that the disclosure of Wiecha, when

taken together with Talati, discloses the status of the delivery of the product and

payment of the product through a communication network as claimed by Appellants.

Specifically, examiner maintains that the *status of a PO*, as disclosed by Wiecha,

encompasses *status of the delivery of the product and payment of the product*, as

claimed by Appellants. Further, Talati discloses (col. 3 lines 4-59):

- *A validated transaction is a transaction in which the TA validates the entities,*

facilitates the transaction and/or validates the contents of the transaction by the

originator. In a validated electronic commerce transaction, either the client, merchant or

transaction administrator can initiate the transaction. In a purchase transaction, the

client initiates a transaction requesting particular items of merchandise or services from

a merchant via the Internet, a dial-up-network, or any suitable network. The electronic

transaction includes details of the transaction such as descriptions of the item(s) that

the client desires to purchase, credit card or check payment information, information on

other types of payment by means of which the item(s) will be purchased, and a unique

transaction identifier that has been generated by the originator and is uniquely

associated with the particular purchase transaction.

- *This information is transmitted to the merchant over the network. In response to*

the purchase order, the merchant generates a payment authorization request for

transmission to the TA. The payment authorization request will have attached to it the unique transaction identifier initially provided by the client along with transaction information. Upon receipt of the payment authorization request the TA will validate the client and the merchant using the information provided. The TA then generates a validation request to the client that includes the unique transaction identifier. This communication between the TA and the client may be encrypted using a suitable encryption method or a set of virtual keys known only to the TA and each individual purchaser.

-   Upon receipt of the validation request, the client decodes, if necessary, the encrypted validation request and extracts the unique transaction identifier therefrom. The identifier is compared to a listing of generated transaction identifiers at the client to confirm that the client authorized the transaction order with which the transaction identifier is associated. Confirmation or denial of the validation is transmitted back to the TA by the originator. This confirmation may be encrypted using a suitable encryption method, if necessary. To provide additional security, a query or group of queries may be included within the validation requests between the TA and the originator. These queries are randomly generated and directed to information known solely by the originator, such as mother's maiden name, social security number, driver's license number, birth date, etc.

-   Upon receipt of validation or non-validation from the originator, the TA confirms or aborts the transaction by notifying the recipient whether or not the transaction is valid based upon the originator's validation response and the accuracy of the information

transmission to the TA. The payment authorization request will have attached to it the unique transaction identifier initially provided by the client along with transaction information. Upon receipt of the payment authorization request the TA will validate the client and the merchant using the information provided. The TA then generates a validation request to the client that includes the unique transaction identifier. This communication between the TA and the client may be encrypted using a suitable encryption method or a set of virtual keys known only to the TA and each individual purchaser.

-   Upon receipt of the validation request, the client decodes, if necessary, the encrypted validation request and extracts the unique transaction identifier therefrom. The identifier is compared to a listing of generated transaction identifiers at the client to confirm that the client authorized the transaction order with which the transaction identifier is associated. Confirmation or denial of the validation is transmitted back to the TA by the originator. This confirmation may be encrypted using a suitable encryption method, if necessary. To provide additional security, a query or group of queries may be included within the validation requests between the TA and the originator. These queries are randomly generated and directed to information known solely by the originator, such as mother's maiden name, social security number, driver's license number, birth date, etc.

-   Upon receipt of validation or non-validation from the originator, the TA confirms or aborts the transaction by notifying the recipient whether or not the transaction is valid based upon the originator's validation response and the accuracy of the information

contained in the transaction request. If the information in the transaction request

checks out, the item(s) ordered may be delivered to the originator by the recipient. The

delivery and communication systems between the client, merchant and TA preferably

consists of some type of computer network such as the Internet, private Intranet or any

suitable network.

Additionally, Examiner asserts that this functionality discloses the comparing *of a*

trading identifier and e-mail address included in the trading information with the trading

identifier included in the trading processing information to output a warning if they are

not coincident, and further to add the trading processing information to the trading

information stored in the clients storage device if they are coincident as claimed by

Appellants. Therefore, examiner maintains the rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Forest O. Thompson Jr. whose telephone number is

(703) 306-5449. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Wynn Coggins can be reached on (703) 308-1344. The fax phone

numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)

872-9326 for regular communications and (703) 872-9327 for After Final

communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or

proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-

3900.

F. Thompson
May 16, 2002

WYNN W. COGGINS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600